



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,680	11/25/2003	Brian Gerrard Devlin	CL/V-32782A	8875
31781	7590	04/09/2009	EXAMINER	
CIBA VISION CORPORATION			VARGOT, MATHIEU D	
PATENT DEPARTMENT				
11460 JOHNS CREEK PARKWAY			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DULUTH, GA 30097-1556			1791	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/723,680	DEVLIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mathieu D. Vargot	1791	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 January 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-11 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-11 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stockinger et al (col. 7, line 59 through col. 8, line 61) as characterized in the instant specification at page 14, lines 6-10 in view of the admitted prior art as set forth in the instant specification at page 2, line 22 through page 3, line 5 and either of Forray et al (see paragraph 0060) or Oku et al (see paragraph 0019).

Stockinger et al and the admitted prior art are applied for reasons of record, the references failing to teach that the anti-oxidant is a water soluble and biocompatible salt of citric acid, and that such a salt would be the sodium, potassium or ammonium salt thereof. Either of Forray et al or Oku et al disclose biocompatible compositions which would include citric acid or its salts as an anti-oxidant. It is submitted that one of ordinary skill in this art knows that citric acid and its common salts are well known in the art for their anti-oxidant properties and that such would have been readily used in the medical device of Stockinger et al as a convenient biocompatible anti-oxidant. While Forray et al and Oku et al do not explicitly teach that the salts would be the sodium, potassium or ammonium salts, it is respectfully submitted that these are very common salts and would have been readily envisaged as the salts intended in the references. For example, Oku et al teaches a number of sodium salts for the anti-oxidants taught in paragraph 0019 and one of ordinary skill in the art would certainly know that sodium

salts would be biocompatible and probably the most common salt employed in pharmacological compositions. Given that citric acid and its salts are known anti-oxidants, one would certainly expect that their use in a medical device would improve the stability thereof so that a reduction in the formation of formic acid and other oxidative by-products would be demonstrated. The exact reduction would have been readily ascertained through routine experimentation.

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In view of the amendment, new art to Forray et al and Oku et al has been applied. It is submitted that the instant sodium, potassium and ammonium salts would have been readily envisaged as suitable salts of citric acid and that one of ordinary skill in the art would know that these would be suitable for use as biocompatible citric acid salts.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mathieu D. Vargot whose telephone number is 571 272-1211. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson, can be reached on 571 272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Vargot
April 7, 2009

/Mathieu D. Vargot/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1791